*PA*rtecipazione e *CO*nflitto
** The Open Journal of Sociopolitical Studies*
http://siba-ese.unisalento.it/index.php/paco
ISSN: 1972-7623 (print version)
ISSN: 2035-6609 (electronic version)
***PACO*, Issue 13(1) 2020: 954-969**
DOI: 10.1285/i20356609v13i1p954

Published in March 15, 2020

BOOK REVIEWS

Marco Giugni, Maria T. Grasso, (2019), *Street Citizens. Protest Politics and Social Movement Activism in the Age of Globalization*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Gaetano Inglese
Sant'Anna School of Advanced Studies

1. Contextualization and research questions

Social movements studies conceive social movements and protest events as occurring in waves. During the age of globalization, these waves of protest have been numerous and scholars have been documenting their changing contours under various analytical aspects. Broadening the picture of the new social movements' paradigm (Touraine 1981; Kriesi, Koopmans, Duyvendak and Giugni 1995), the Global Justice Movement was the first one to reshape the characteristics and modalities of protest in a globalised world (della Porta 2007). The movement symbolically broke out with the event often referred to as "the Battle of Seattle", when a series of protests and gatherings took place against The World Trade Organization Conference in 1999, and it developed throughout the following years with the involvement of a broad variety of protest groups, extending its organizational configuration and deeply innovating the repertoire of contention (Tilly and Tarrow 2007). Remarkably, the Global Justice Movement, also known under various other labels such as no-global, anti or alter-globalization, was an encompassing movement bringing together a broad range of actors, networks, organizations and social

groups, with different claims and identities, all united under the common master frame of the fight against neoliberal globalization as well as social and political injustices at the global scale (Pianta 2001).

This long-standing movement displayed the mobilization from below of a global civil society (della Porta, Andretta, Mosca and Reiter 2006), it organised innovative protest initiatives such as the European and World Social Forums to denounce the economic and political injustices of a neoliberal world economy while at the same time being able to involve new kinds of actors in the protest field, most notably environmental, radical youth, peace and solidarity groups, among many others. As several scholars argued, this feature accounts for the blurring of the distinction between "old" and "new" social movements, leading to some extent towards a normalization in terms of social composition, value orientations and issues of mobilization.

Nevertheless, from 2008 onward, the Great Recession hit hard western societies worldwide and brought about a new wave of contention that reached its peak around the years 2011-2012, epitomised by such events as Occupy Wall Street in New York or the *Indignados* movement in Spain and Greece (della Porta 2015; Kaldor and Selchow 2015). Protesters in Europe and the US have been remarkably drawing the attention of the public opinion to the social and economic inequalities that the wealthiest countries in the world were experiencing. In the European context, as the economic downturn evolved in the debt crisis, many national governments enacted policies devoted to cuts in public expenditures and most notably in the Welfare sector, following a general policy trend promoted by the so-called Troika made of the European Commission, European Central Bank and International Monetary Fund. As a direct response to the policies of austerity through which national governments at the European level intended to face the economic crisis, thousands of people took the streets and gathered in a variety of protest events (Gerbaudo 2017). This new transnational wave of protest (della Porta and Mattoni 2014) which witnessed the rise of social movements mobilizing against austerity and financial capitalism, has led scholars to focus their attention on the innovations that these new movements brought in the protest arena. The movements in time of austerity were directly concerned with economic and social problems, they were massively mobilizing a constituency of citizens seemingly different from the one involved in the Global Justice Movements, they were adopting a framing strategy strictly related to a democratic claim for political responsibility, displaying a repertoire of contention which particularly privileged mass street demonstrations. For these reasons, scholarship argued for the need to bring the analysis of capitalism back in the study of the most recent protest politics across the world, as to revive the analysis of the social base, the grievances,

as well as the motivational and emotional factors underlying the mass mobilizations in contemporary times (della Porta 2015).

It is exactly in this debate that the book by Marco Giugni and Maria T. Grasso breaks into to offer its contribution. The book relies on the general assumption that contemporary protest politics is shaped by long-term structural changes brought about by globalization and then catalysed by the 2008 economic crisis that arguably developed the potential for a different sort of political participation. In this respect, these transformations driven by globalization may have at first opened the space for the engagement of a broader constituency of citizens in global politics through the Global Justice Movement, and then they have brought back old material issues and grievances along with anti-austerity protests. Furthermore, political participation in the age of globalization may witness changes to be documented in the social bases mobilised through protest, in the relation between electoral-institutional and protest-unconventional politics, and consequently in the organizational as well as in the attitudinal and motivational dimensions of protest politics. To detect and even challenge these hypotheses, the study focuses on a micro-level analysis of participation in street demonstrations providing a rich and comprehensive analysis and drawing from a variety of research traditions and approaches.

2. Theoretical framework, methodology and book structure

After having contextualized their research within the most relevant contemporary tendencies in political participation and social movements studies as partly reviewed above, namely within the study of protest politics and social movements activism in the age of globalization and late neoliberalism (della Porta, Andretta, Fernandes, O'Connor, Romanos and Vogiatzoglou 2016), in the first introductory chapter the authors present the conceptual framework adopted in their research design. They conceptualize the dynamics of participation in street demonstrations as composed of three interrelated layers of factors, which coherently follow the chapter structure of the volume. The first layer that they refer to is the mobilizing context in which protest takes form and develops. This macro-contextual dimension is conceptualized as made of three interlinked sub-dimensions, namely a demand, a mobilization and a supply-side one. This mobilizing context is considered as channelling the micro-structural dynamics of participation, indeed the second layer of the conceptual framework. In this regard, the authors focus on the socio-structural base of protest in street demonstrations, the relation between institutional and protest politics, and finally on the pre-existing mobilizing structures through which people mobilize and engage in collective action. Finally, the third layer of factors

taken in account pertains to the social-psychological dynamics of protest politics specified in terms of both cognitive-attitudinal and affective-emotional aspects of individual level predispositions among street demonstrators and to the motivational factors underpinning protest participation. Thus, the conceptual framework aims to cover a comprehensive explanation of who, how and why participates in street demonstrations, and includes a wide set of variables aimed at analysing the sociodemographic profile of demonstrators, their mobilizing structures, attitudes, values and motivations to protest.

Given this multidimensional conceptual framework, protest politics is therefore analysed through the lens of structural, cultural and rational accounts of political participation and social movements scholarship, building on a rich dataset based on original survey data collected in street demonstrations held during the years 2009 – 2013, in a comparative perspective. The countries covered by the comparative research design are seven: United Kingdom, Sweden, Switzerland, Belgium, Netherlands, Italy and Spain. They differ under several aspects and more crucially under the mobilizing context that they display for protest politics in terms of the structure of national cleavages, availability of resources for collective action, political opportunity structures and protest cultures and legacies. However, they provide a faithful picture of the European context and its diversity.

The book structure is composed by a first analytical step in which the authors analyse the contentious potential of European citizens through a general population survey employing data from the ESS, and a second one in which they present and evaluate protest survey data retrieved in the cross-national CCC (Caught in the Act of protesting: Contextualizing Contestation) collaborative research project, adopting an original methodology and sampling strategy (Klandermans and Smith 2002; Van Stekelenburg, Walgrave, Klandermans and Verhulst 2012). The method consists in surveying protesters in the field while attending a demonstration, through a sampling technique which aims to obtain random samples of demonstrators and reduce the non-response bias combining both face-to-face structured interviews and delivery of postal surveys.

Following the assessment of the contentious potential of European citizens and its cross-national variations, the analysis of survey data develops throughout the book orderly following the conceptual scheme outlined above, according to a twofold logic scheme. In a first step, the data are disaggregated by country, issue of demonstration, economic or cultural, and type of demonstrator, activist or occasional, in order to provide a descriptive analysis of each given variable within the sample. Then, logistic multivariate regressions are adopted to evaluate the impact of each of these variables on the political commitment to participation, in terms of the determination to take to the streets in defence of a cause.

After having provided a theoretical and methodological overview of the volume, we can now move to a more critical and extensive examination of the findings discussed and the hypothesis challenged in each chapter.

3. The contentiousness of European citizens: the mobilizing context

To examine the contentious potential of European citizens in the seven countries under scrutiny, the authors provide an overview of the key factors that explain political mobilization employing general population ESS data. Such a picture depicts important cross-national variations. To begin with, they show the percentage of people by country who have participated in a variety of political activities, ranging from forms of conventional participation to more unconventional and even disruptive actions. Remarkably, even if voting cross-nationally confirms to be the most common channel citizens have at their disposal to make their voice heard, Italy and Spain show a larger protest potential especially when it comes to protesting in streets demonstrations as compared to other countries in which citizens privilege less confrontational forms of political participation such as petitioning, contacting politicians, campaigning and working in political organizations, engaging in consumerist activities and boycotting. This pattern shows at first cross-national differences in the forms of political participation that citizens are more likely to engage into, and that in Northern and Central European countries, more sensitive to the environmental issue and less affected by the economic crisis, citizens are more committed to adopting the channels made available by liberal democracy. Strongly related to the analysis of protest activities, the organizational involvement of European citizens confirms this pattern of distinction between Southern European countries and the others. The indicators of organizational involvement are party and union membership, volunteering and work for a charity organization. They show an overall low level of party membership, but relevant cross-national variations in union membership, with Sweden and Belgium showing the highest level in this respect, and UK and Southern European countries displaying a low level of unionization. This pattern reflects a general trend in political alienation moderated by the resilience of different political and organizational cultures of each country. Coming to the cultural aspect of protest potential, the authors engage in the analysis of political values and attitudes. Indeed, they intend political values as cultural factors underlying political behaviour and political cleavages (Kriesi, Grande, Dolezal, Helbling, Hoglinger, Hutter and Wuest 2012). In this respect, the left-libertarian and right-authoritarian distinction for values orientation are analysed cross-nationally, along with a specific focus on immigration. Then, political attitudes, intended as political predispositions towards politics and political objects, are

operationalised in terms of political interest, satisfaction with how democracy works, political trust and political efficacy. Results show once again trends of distinction of Southern European countries from the rest of Europe. Spain and Italy display the stronger support for leftist values combined with a lower level of trust and satisfaction with democracy, suggesting a cultural additional effect on structural and organizational alienation of citizens. Overall, ESS data show a European picture in which citizens in certain countries, notably Italy and Spain, are more likely to protest in street demonstrations, avoid more conventional and traditional channels of participation, suggesting the twofold impact of an economic and a political crisis for the development of new forms of protest politics (della Porta and Andretta 2013; della Porta and Portos 2020).

4. Microstructural dynamics of mobilization in street demonstrations

Given this strong empirical basis, the analysis of the comparative trends in protest participation in Europe then focuses on the microstructural dynamics of mobilization among street citizens. In this respect, the authors present a structural analysis of the social bases of protest politics. In doing so, the authors also engage in the long-lasting theoretical debate about the structure-action nexus in order to respond to the recent scholars' call to bring the analysis of capitalism back in the study of protest politics and to critically engage with the hypothesis of the emergence of a new social base, notably the precariat, for contemporary political mobilization (della Porta 2015). Remarkably, the analysis of the structural impacts of late neoliberalism on labour relations and resources' distribution among social groups leads to a re-examination of the theory on political cleavages as previously assessed by the literature on new social movements. In this precise respect, scholars of political cleavages have been arguing for the development of a new social division brought about by globalization processes named as integration-demarcation cleavage (Kriesi *et al.* 2012). This division allegedly witnesses the rise of a new class of urban and high educated socio-cultural professionals as opposed to less educated and rural manual workers, the former more benefitting of the advantages of globalization contrarily to the latter, excluded from this general social advancement. According to this paradigm, socio-cultural middle-class professionals should be the central social base for new social movements' mobilization. Furthermore, in the aftermath of the Great Recession old bread-and-butter material grievances appear to be brought into the fore by the group of the "left-behind" of neoliberal globalization, seemingly emerging among urban, young but unemployed groups, mostly affected by the precarisation of labour market, part-time jobs and cuts in welfare expenditures (della Porta

2015; della Porta *et al.* 2016). Nevertheless, the hypothesis that protest has remained the channel of the most deprived and resource-poor groups, which challenges the new social movements' paradigm, is not confirmed by the investigation of the social bases of street demonstrations. In this respect, the authors argue that the social basis of contemporary political protest in the age of post-crisis globalization does not show remarkable differences with new social movements' one (Kriesi *et al.* 1995): data tend to overrepresent middle classes and underrepresent working classes. Although the authors argue against the precariat hypothesis and verify a sort of structural continuity of protest in times of post-crisis globalization with the new social movements, the picture they present is not so neat. Looking at the role of social class and occupation, albeit with few exceptions, most street demonstrators belong to the salariat, intermediate professions and students, being the traditional working-class underrepresented. However, several points must be specified when dealing with class analysis in contemporary times, especially when considering the working-class. First, in some countries, like Italy, Sweden and Switzerland, the protestors sociodemographic profile testifies the relevance of unemployed, suggesting the plausibility of the precariat as a new social base for protest. Then, more resource-poor groups tend to be overrepresented in demonstrations over economic issues and to attend more frequently street protest than occasional demonstrators. In order to overcome material and structural barrier to participation, those lower-class individuals tend to be particularly committed to economic issues: in sum, even if people from working classes are less likely to take to the street as compared to middle-class individuals, who mostly attend demonstrations over cultural issues, those who do so figure out to be particularly committed, self-identified with working class. In this respect, it is worth noting the role of class identification as a relevant variable explaining micro-structural mobilization. While form an objective point of view the proportion of those who belong to the working and lower classes is less represented, the number of those who subjectively identify with them is much higher. This evidence suggests the relevance of subjective structural position and class identification as a more crucial explanatory variable in the analysis of the social base of contemporary protest. Thus, coming back to the idea of the precariat, while it is empirically true that young and unemployed individuals are structurally located in subaltern positions, it could be argued indeed that it is the subjective component of their structural position to be crucial in order to make sense of their political behaviour.

Chapter IV delves in the analysis of the interconnection between protest and institutional politics. On this point, the main theoretical reference that the authors argue about is the so-called substitution thesis (Norris 2002) and the urge to bridge the literature of protest politics and social movements with the one on electoral behaviour and political

parties as proposed by some scholars (della Porta, Fernàndez, Kouki and Mosca 2017). In fact, scholars of party politics have long been recording a decline in party membership and trust in intermediary bodies of representative democracy, a process that would seemingly lead towards the transformation of party democracy suffering widespread political alienation and apathy (Mair 2013). However, according to scholars of unconventional participation, the other side of the coin of the decline in electoral turnout and partisanship is its replacement by an increase in unconventional participation and political activism. On the other hand, other scholars have argued that voting and protesting should not be seen as mutually exclusive political activities, while they somehow reinforce one another. In times of crisis, when leftist governments and social democratic parties appear under pressure, progressive movements could hopefully act as to reinvigorate political participation and support for progressive actors. To evaluate this hypothesises, the authors examine institutional and extra-institutional participation among demonstrators to understand whether they alienate from institutional politics limiting themselves to protest politics, as the substitution thesis would argue, or whether they engage in both types of participation. Data show that the substitution thesis does not hold sway: those who engage in street demonstrations are less likely to alienate from voting. If data seems to lead to the conclusion that protest becomes an additional tool for those who are already engaged in institutional participation, this does not imply that those who don't vote just turn to join a protest or other forms of unconventional participation. In fact, against the substitution thesis, regression models show that those who hold a strong partisan identification and institutional engagement, especially on the left, are more committed to political activism, thus resulting for a strong cross-over between institutional-partisan and extra-institutional contentious politics. Thus, data show that being activist in demonstrations is linked with a stronger cross-domain political participation, being therefore unlikely that those who are alienating from voting are moving to protest in turn. Rather than a substitution of protest arena, an argument which would also carry about a positive normativism, the study suggests that we are witnessing an additional reinforcing effect of protest politics on institutional politics, while those who turn away from institutional politics are more likely to become inactive than to take to the streets. This insightful conclusion, matched with the previous one about the role of class identification, shows the role of identity and organizational membership for political commitment to take the street in the name of a cause, while it more pessimistically underlines the still worrying decline in institutional participation which is not likely to be replaced by different forms of engagement. Still, what needs to be underlined further from this argument is the role of organizational identification for political mobilization, suggesting paradoxically the impact of institutional participation on protest politics

instead of the opposite. Nevertheless, what this argument seemingly undervalues lies at the core of the anti-austerity demonstrations, as exemplified by the *Indignados* movements: the detachment from political parties and the stress on economic issues. The literature on anti-austerity protest and movements parties have been suggesting that these movements have brought to the fore the grievances of dissatisfied deprived individuals, who felt unrepresented by existing mainstream parties and that have then supported newcomers such as Podemos, Syriza and Five Star Movement (Gerbaudo 2017; della Porta *et al.* 2017). Indeed, if a high level of partisanship is found among activist demonstrators, protest should not be entirely the outcome of a process of popular dealignment form party politics: those individuals who felt at the margin of institutional politics, have probably taken the streets as first time participant in demonstrations. Remarkably, this process is more pronounced in Southern Europe, where protest over economic issues has been stronger and "old" organizational actors have not been playing a crucial role for mobilization, especially in Spain (Andretta 2018).

This conclusion leads the authors to the analysis of the mobilizing structures which lead individuals to protest. The question thus explicitly becomes why people protest, whether in reason of their organizational embeddedness or because of an independent choice. In order to provide an argument on this point, the authors here interestingly build upon different research traditions on political participation, namely the structural, the social-psychological and rational choice one. According to the first, much emphasis has to be put on the "being asked" question, which focuses on the pre-existing networks and ties that pull people in collective action. Thus, organizational embeddedness is determinant in pulling people to participation, being recruitment the key mechanism for protest behaviour (Passy and Giugni 2001). While the structural account focuses on the pre-existing structure, the social-psychological one pays more emphasis on feelings, thoughts and predispositions to engage in protest (Klandermans 2004). Finally, rational choice approaches, even if less popular among current scholarship, stress the role of costs-benefits calculation to engage in collective action. In the examination of protest survey data, the authors address these three factors relating to the broader concept of mobilizing structure, cross-nationally and across issue and type of demonstrator. They examine at first associational involvement in terms of passive and active membership and show a more pronounced organizational embeddedness of Swedish demonstrators as opposed to Italians and Spaniards. Concerning the channels of recruitment, indirect, interpersonal or direct ones hold a differential impact. The analysis seems to argue for the stronger relevance of direct interpersonal channels of recruitment in particular for activists who are more likely to "push" themselves to protest, than online social media on whom rely the most occasional demonstrators or first-time protesters as in the case

of anti-austerity protests in Spain. Coming to the question of structural or social-psychological factors on commitment, the analysis here seems not to privilege one approach on the other while adopting both. Organizational involvement, interpersonal networks, along with attitudes and predispositions as political interest and political efficacy, seem to play a role, thus confirming a more structural account. However, political attitudes remain very important as well.

5. Social-psychological dynamics of mobilization in street demonstrations

In Chapter VI, the authors deal exactly with the role of cognition and affect among demonstrators, thus moving to the elaboration of the last layer of factors of their conceptual framework concerning the social-psychological dynamics of mobilization. By attitudes, the authors refer to people's predispositions towards specific political objects as well as towards politics more in general, identifying four core political attitudes related to political participation: political interest, satisfaction with democracy, political trust and political efficacy. Examining how people taking part to street demonstrations score on these variables makes sense of the level of detachment and alienation from politics and enlightens the psychological process underlying participation, with a specific concern on the individual's cultural dimension at work (Jasper 2014). The authors bring the concept as traditionally employed in the literature, paying attention to the implications they hold in terms of cognitive process activated, their interactions as in the case of trust and efficacy, and sub-specification such as in the case of political efficacy, being it internal or external. In addition, building on the strand of scholarship which has been emphasizing the role of feelings, emotions and culture more in general for protest participation in social movements studies (Goodwin, Jasper and Polletta 2001; McGarry and Jasper 2015), they identify four primary emotions, notably anger, worry, fear and frustration. The point on which the descriptive analysis seems to converge is that demonstrators are overall more politically interested individuals than the general population, and that they hold a sceptical attitude towards democratic functioning, while at the same time being quite confident of their efficacy and influence in the political arena. Thus, participation seems to be a matter of politicized, mistrustful but self-confident and effective individuals, a portrait that does not fit well with the general image of demonstrators in times of economic crisis as disempowered and deprived individuals shouting against material and political injustices. Here, the authors have in fact to specify that, besides this general pattern, there are strong variations among countries: Italians and Spaniards do not hold a strong political external efficacy and keep low level of trust towards institutions; Swiss

and Swedish, instead, appear more fitting with the critical citizens paradigm described by the literature (Norris 1999). Looking at the emotions felt by demonstrators, the data portrait a picture where all four emotions are equally present in demonstrators, albeit with a remarkable lower level of fear. Also, in this respect, cross-national variations reveal differential dynamics developing across Europe: Spaniards and Italian demonstrators feel more anger and worry than, for example, British and Swedish who look like the most frustrated. Worry is not everywhere equally present, being lower among British, Swedish and Swiss demonstrators. The southern European case is meaningful as it shows how political participation is charged by strong feelings although somehow divergent ones: if anger has to be intended as an emotion stimulating political mobilization, especially present among activists protesting about material economic issues, worry could be interpreted as an avoidance emotion, eventually leading to political apathy. Moreover, when looking at the impact of the four primary emotions on the commitment to protest, data show a strong relationship of three out of four of them, namely anger, fear and frustration. However, the key contribution here does not rely on the impact of emotions alone on commitment to protest, but instead on their specific combination with political attitudes. While internal political efficacy, political interest and perceived effectiveness, and therefore the awareness of being able to matter in the political arena, hold the strongest effect on their commitment to protest, lower level of trust, satisfaction with democracy and external political efficacy are negatively related to commitment. Emotions are strongly associated with commitment and they interestingly combine with certain attitudes producing a stronger effect. This is the case of political interest and anger, the one reinforcing the other, but crucially the case of worry, notably an avoidance emotion, which nevertheless carries a positive impact on the commitment to protest and even captures the effect of satisfaction with democracy. In sum, the data presented about the cognitive role of core political attitudes support the idea that social-psychological dynamics play a relevant role in protest participation and that there are strong individual cognitive and psychological dynamics accounting for participation which develop trough processes of combination and interaction with the more structural dimensions discussed so far. Indeed, data seem to depict a picture of demonstrators as interested, effective and critical citizens, which is far from the picture of politically alienated and detached individuals. However, lower levels of satisfaction with democracy, low political trust towards governmental institutions and low external political efficacy are more common in Italy and Spain, notably the two countries where anti-austerity mobilizations were more pronounced and where citizens showed a higher level of anger and worry, which nonetheless pushed them to mobilize massively. If the common view of some part of the scholarly literature focusing on political alienation has been

understanding the rise of unconventional participation as an indicator of the disenchantment and individualisation of democratic citizens towards representative politics, the data presented in the book try to cast some doubts on precisely this assumption. Protesters indeed seem to fit more with the critical rather than alienated citizens ideal type, while in some countries protest, especially anti-austerity concerned by economic issues, flows form dissatisfaction, mistrust and lack of perceived external efficacy combined with higher levels of internal political efficacy, anger and worry.

The final analytical step of the work concerns motivations to action. Here, as already seen throughout the book, the authors analytically build on the existent literature and concepts. From Klandermans (2004) they derive three main elements that may account for motivation: instrumentality, identity and ideology. Indeed, action could be individual or collective-expressive or individual or collective-instrumental. People can take to the streets for several motivations, as individuals to improve their living condition or also acting on behalf of a group fighting for a collective good. The idea of collective action thus consists in that form of action in which individuals act as being part of a group and in the pursuit of collective shared interest. In doing so, the idea of class consciousness in Marxist terms is nowadays picked up by the notion of collective identity, as mainly developed within the cultural paradigm in social movements studies (McGarry and Jasper 2015; Flesher Fominaya 2010). Thus, collective identification and group-based identities could be regarded as the general process within which structural as well as cultural factors, as discussed so far, are addressed to promote political action. In this respect, the authors argue about the limits of defining social action as motivated just by instrumentality or by identity and they contend the need to adopt a more comprehensive perspective, following the recent call in social movements analysis to readdress the study of capitalism in order to better understand the processes of identity formation (della Porta 2015). Accordingly, structure and culture are not to be adopted separately, while it is precisely their interaction that better explains the more nuanced features of political participation and protest politics in the age of post-crisis globalization. Structure, indeed, needs politicization to came into being politically. It follows that individuals need motivations to be developed to put in place a collective political action. Motivations are in this sense operationalised in terms of instrumental or expressive ones, both individual and collective, while the extent of identification is understood as identification with other people in demonstrations or with the staging organization. Across countries, it seems that expressive and instrumental collective motivations, such as expressing views and solidarity or pressuring politicians for change, are the most common motivation underpinning protest. Additionally, horizontal identification with other people in the street is stronger than vertical identification with the staging organization. This interestingly

shows that expressive and collective motivations are more crucial and correlated to commitment than instrumental and individual ones, confirming the idea of the centrality of collective identity formation for contemporary protest. What is missed here is the explanation of how these identities are politicised and which actor leads this process, with horizontal identification as a member of a group or an organization seemingly being more prominent than vertical identification with the staging organization.

6. Discussion: understanding protest in the age of globalization

Summing up the findings and the most relevant implications for the understanding of contemporary protest politics which this book offers, some points must be finally stressed. From a methodological and empirical standpoint, the book by Giugni and Grasso undoubtedly offers a rich, extensive and rigorous analysis of protest in post-crisis globalized Europe. The book structure appears clear, coherent and carefully organised throughout the entire analysis. The conceptual framework outlined at the beginning is thus carefully developed in each chapter adopting a schematic and clear procedure. Each chapter begins with descriptive and comparative analysis, followed by an explanation of the impact of each variable on commitment to protest. As discussed before, the books extensively engage with a multidisciplinary literature on political participation, pays attention to several approaches and puts forward a comprehensive analysis, following structural, rational choice, cultural paradigms and adopting tools from political science, political sociology and psychology as well. The result is a rigorous and reliable empirical study of the main trends in contemporary political participation that sharply engages and challenges the most relevant hypothesis put forward by the scholarship. First, the authors moderate the argument about the existence of the precariat as the new social base for protest (della Porta 2015) and show the persistence of the mobilization of the new social movements constituency, while at the same time stressing the importance of the subjective structural position and the increasing identification with the working class of individuals who don't objectively belong to it. Then, the authors challenge the so-called substitution thesis (Norris 2002), arguing for an interaction and reinforcement effect of protest and institutional politics, thus advancing the idea that we should still worry for the declining institutional participation, as far as there is no evidence that who alienates form voting should move into protest in turn. Moreover, they underline the relevance of mobilizing structures and organizational embeddedness for commitment to protest, thus arguing against the thesis of the affirmation of an atomised and disorganized society (Mair 2013). Finally, considering cognitive and affective aspects of

participation, they counter the political alienation thesis and instead support the idea of a critical citizenry taking part in street demonstrations along with a growing interest in politics (Norris 1999). In addition, they argue for the relevance of collective identification to motivate people to protest, especially horizontal and with the lower classes, against an individualistic and instrumental view of collective action. To sum up, it is precisely this kind of methodologically clear and empirically strong discussion of the most relevant hypothesis debated within the literature that constitutes the principal contribution of this study to the field of protest and political participation studies. However, the strength of this study coincides also with its limitation. Although being a very rich and extensive empirical analysis it remains in large part a descriptive one, carefully accounting for variations across cases and variables and examining major theoretical arguments. In doing so, it provides many insightful research suggestions and eventually generates new hypotheses, but without further exploring them and building new explanations. Finally, the ideas of normalization, for which protest should not be seen as an alternative practice to politics, and of the pluralization of the issues at stake when protesting along with the overall increasingly urgent claim for social integration of protesters are the main lines along which protest politics is considered developing, according to Giugni and Grasso's insightful contribution.

References

Andretta M., (2018), "Protest in Italy in Times of Crisis: A Cross-Government Comparison", *South European Society and Politics*, 23:1, 97-114, London: Routledge

Della Porta D., (2007), *The Global Justice Movement. Cross national and Transnational Perspective*, Boulder: Paradigm Publishers

Della Porta D., (2015), *Social Movements in Times of austerity*, London: Polity

Della Porta D., Andretta M., (2013) "Protesting for justice and democracy: Italian *Indignados*?", *Contemporary Italian Politics*, 5:1, 23-37, London: Routledge

Della Porta D., Andretta M., Fernandes T., O'Connor F., Romanos E., Vogiatzoglou M., (2016), *Late Neoliberalism and its Discontents in the Economic Crisis. Comparing Social Movements in the European Periphery*, London: Palgrave McMillan

Della Porta D., Andretta M., Mosca L., Reiter H., (2006), *Globalization from below. Transnational Activists and Protest Networks*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Della Porta D., Fernández J., Kouki H., Mosca L., (2017), *Movement Parties Against Austerity*, London: Polity

Della Porta D., Mattoni A., (2014), *Spreading Protest. Social Movements in Times of Crisis*, Colchester: ECPR Press

Della Porta D., Portos M., (2020), "Social movements in times of inequalities: Struggling against austerity in Europe", *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics*, 53:116-126

Flesher Fominaya C., (2010), "Collective Identity in Social Movements: Central Concepts and Debates"*, Sociology Compass*, 4/6: 393–404

Gerbaudo P., (2017), *The Mask and The Flag. Populism, Citizenism and Global Protest*, London: Hurst & Company

Goodwin J., Jasper J., Polletta F., (2001), *Passionate Politics. Emotions and Social Movements*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press

Jasper J., (2014), *Protest. A Cultural Introduction to Social Movements*, London: Polity

Kaldor M., Selchow S., (2015), *Subterranean Politics in Europe*, London: Palgrave McMillan

Klandermans B., (2004), "The Demand and Supply of Participation: Social-Psychological Correlates of Participation in Social Movements", in Snow D., Soule S., Kriesi H., *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 360-379

Klandermans B., Smith J., (2002), "Survey Research: A Case for Comparative Design", in Klandermans B., Staggenborg S., *Methods for Social Movements Research*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 3 – 31

Kriesi H., Grande E., Dolezal M., Helbling M., Hoglinger D., Hutter S., Wuest B., (2012), *Political Conflict in Western Europe*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Kriesi H., Koopmans R., Duyvendak J. W., Giugni M., (1995), *New Social Movements in Western Europe. A Comparative Analysis*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Mair P., (2013), *Ruling the Void. The Hollowing of Western Democracy*, London: Verso

McGarry A., Jasper J., (2015), *The Identity Dilemma. Social Movements and Collective Identity*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press

Norris P., (1999), *Critical Citizens. Global Support for Democratic Government*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Norris P., (2002), *Democratic Phoenix. Reinventing Political Activism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Passy F., Giugni M., (2001), "Social Networks and Individual Perceptions: Explaining Differential Participation in Social Movements", *Sociological Forum*, 16 (I): 123 – 153

Pianta M., (2001), *Globalizzazione dal basso. Economia mondiale e movimenti sociali*, Roma: Manifestolibri

Tilly C., Tarrow S., (2007), *Contentious Politics*, Boulder: Paradigm Publishers

Touraine A., (1981), *The Voice and the Eye. An Analysis of Social Movements*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Van Stekelenburg J., Walgrave S., Klandermans B., Verhulst J., (2012), "Contextualizing Contestation: Framework, Design and Data", *Mobilization*, 17 (3): 249-262